DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 435 570 SO 029 872

AUTHOR Woolman, David C.
TITLE International Development of Peace Studies and Education, 1960-1990.
PUB DATE 1992-08-19
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the World Education Fellowship Biennial Conference (36th, Hartford, CT, August 17-20, 1992).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Concept Formation; *Conflict Resolution; Foreign Countries; Futures (of Society); *Global Approach; Higher Education; *International Cooperation; *Peace; *Technological Advancement; World War II
IDENTIFIERS Historical Background; Internationalism; *Peace Education; *Peace Studies; Social Conflict

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on two aspects of the development of international approaches in peace studies: one concern is to examine the conceptual evolution of global thinking about social conflict and peace, while the other is to investigate the origins, goals, and work of international institutions which conduct research and education related to world problems of conflict resolution and peace. The paper is divided into sections on: (1) "Origins"; (2) "Conceptual Development"; (3) "Critical Perspectives"; (4) "Applied Peace Studies"; (5) "Peace Education"; and (6) "Future Directions." The paper concludes that the international development and structure of peace studies have reflected the emergence of a global culture and awareness after World War II, associated with the shrinkage of distance brought about by the revolution in communications and transportation. Contains 37 notes. ((BT))

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

SO

ED 435 570

# International Development of Peace Studies and Education 1960-1990.

by
David C. Woolman

Rhode Island College

Paper for Presentation
at the
36th WEF International Conference.

SO 029 872

David C. Woolman

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

University of Hartford

Hartford, Connecticut

August 19, 1992.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Contents

I. Origins . . . . . 1

II. Conceptual Development . . . . . 4

III. Critical Perspectives . . . . . 11

IV. Applied Peace Studies . . . . . 14

V. Peace Education . . . . . 17

VI. Future Directions . . . . . 20

Endnotes . . . . . 23

International Development of Peace Studies and Education
1960-1990.

This paper will focus on two aspects of the development of international approaches in peace studies. One concern will be to examine the conceptual evolution of global thinking about social conflict and peace. The other will be to investigate the origins, goals and work of international institutions which conduct research and education related to world problems of conflict resolution and peace.

The historic origins of international approaches to peace can be traced to ancient political and religious structures which sought to discourage violence by various forms of social control. Greek city states, for example, arranged for a temporary peace to assure public safety during sacred events like the Olympic Games; longer term peace plans were pursued through leagues and alliances. The Roman Empire achieved peace for short intervals through territorial conquest, universal legal institutions and a security policy based on the maxim "if you desire peace prepare for war." This linkage of peace to military preparedness is the foundation for the modern concept of negative peace. In this conception the absence of war is made more likely by deterrence which requires a strong defense for protection from attack.

Religious philosophy also contributed to the spread of ideas of peace among diverse cultures. The Hindu concept of ahimsa or non-violence, Christian teachings that favor pacifism and the Buddhist practice of non-violence stand out in this respect. In Medieval Europe a region-wide 'Peace of God' was declared at times by the Pope to restore order and preserve life amidst the excesses of feudal warfare.

Precursors of modern ideas about peace emerged during the Renaissance in the humanist writings of Desiderius Erasmus, Thomas More and Juan Vives. Vives' notion that knowledge must be put into action anticipates the current idea that peace education should be linked to action for peace. More's view of the ideal state in Utopia introduces a type of constructivism which survives today in the 'world order' and 'preferred world' schools of thought. A tension between ideal and utilitarian perspectives arose with Niccolo Machiavelli's idea that war is a just instrument of state policy; this viewpoint was developed in the context of factional warfare between Italian city states which were struggling for autonomy against foreign domination. Machiavelli's linkage of political ends with the means of war has shaped the political behavior of

nation states ever since. In our century the recurrent horrors of modern warfare have led many to question the idea that war has any justification or utility as a means to a political end. This critical perspective is one of the mainsprings in peace research which, since 1960, has appropriated utilitarian analysis to challenge the idea that war has any intrinsic value as a policy instrument. Moreover, this orientation has brought peace studies into conflict with some traditional assumptions found in the study of political science and international relations.

Enlightenment thought in the 18th century strengthened global thinking about human nature and the role of world order in assuring survival. The decline of religious warfare after 1700 brought forth hope that human reason might find a means to end war. Jean Jacques Rousseau and Immanuel Kant are major figures in this development. In 1750 Rousseau observed that traditional arts and sciences divorced man from nature, decreased his freedom and failed to purify his morals. He postulated that the natural goodness of humankind was subject to corruption by the influence of institutional life. In Emile, Rousseau's treatise on education, the concept of natural education as a means for developing geo-political virtue is developed. Several facets of Emile's education are familiar to peace educators today; these include cultivation of compassion, spiritual reasoning, aesthetic judgment, romantic love, the study of ideal social contracts and plans for perpetual peace. The goal of such education is not patriotism or gentility but an identification with all humanity and acquisition of the capacity to avoid domination and servitude in a quest for freedom. These aims recur today in liberation theology and conscientization, two peace education strategies which work to eliminate conditions of social oppression in Latin America.

The idea that universal ethics should inform political behavior was strengthened by Kant's effort to reinforce good will through the categorical imperative. His advice was to "act only on that maxim through which you can ... will that it should become a universal law." Kant's inquiries into the psychological causes of war led him to develop an educational plan to build a new morality based on honor and love of human dignity which would replace the tradition that associated honor with militarism. Finally, Kant's Perpetual Peace, published in 1795, proposes a world federation of free states which anticipates many later ideas of world government as a means for peacebuilding.

Beginnings of an empirical perspective on the world and the quantitative study of war can be traced to the work of Adolphe Quetelet, a Belgian astronomer and mathematician who pioneered in the collection of uniform and comparable international statistics. Quetelet also applied probability theory to the study of human behavior; his studies of the numerical constancy of voluntary acts like crime stimulated a debate on the significance of free will versus social determinism. Both of these perspectives remain critical aspects in the study of war and peace.

New strands of internationalism emerged prior to World War I. In 1899 the first world peace convention was held at The Hague. Fannie F.P. Andrews, an American educator who organized the American School Peace League in 1908, later established an International School League to promote international understanding; this organization was the basis for the establishment of the International Bureau of Education in 1926. After the war the League of Nations introduced a program to develop tolerance and respect for cultural differences in Europe.[1] While clouds of war were again gathering over Europe in the 1930's, Bertrand Russell proposed that education had the capacity to develop a human solidarity that would increase international cooperation.

A new focus on world citizenship developed in the 1940's. The rise of the Cold War after 1945 was attended by the growth of education for international understanding. In Scandinavia this form of education became compulsory. Meanwhile, Mohandas Gandhi laid a foundation for later peace education by applying the Hindu concept of non-violence to the political struggle of India against British colonial rule. Gandhi's thought which developed in the context of the Third World was destined to influence peace action in the First World during the American civil rights struggle.

New international organizations and research centers emerged in the 1950's to initiate a more comprehensive academic approach to peace studies.[2] These included the Pugwash Movement, the Center for Research on Conflict Resolution at the University of Michigan and the International Peace Research Institute in Oslo. The Pugwash conferences brought scientists together from around the world to discuss problems of modern warfare and other peace related issues linked to science and technology.[3] The most significant international education effort at this time was probably UNESCO's Associated Schools Project which promoted a worldwide program for study of disarma-

ment, human rights and international understanding. The focus of this project was and is the improvement of teaching and cultivation of youth awareness about world issues through problem solving and understanding of divergent viewpoints. School efforts are coordinated by UNESCO commissions in different countries.

The motivating forces that have shaped these peace programs can be found in the realm of objective world conditions; these include the escalation of the violence and destructiveness of war in the 20th century, increasing assaults on basic human rights and the proliferation of socio-economic structures which tend to deny basic human needs and exacerbate conflict. Militarism and the arms race which it promotes divert capital resources from market driven economic production to an economy based on artificial demand for rapidly obsolescent goods i.e. weapons. In this process resources are drained away from health, education and other human services. Alternative visions of the future are a major catalyst in peace thought. Hope for a better world is the underlying motivation for many projects in peace research; the objective is to discover new knowledge which may contribute to the improvement of peace-keeping, peacemaking and peacebuilding.

II.

In introducing the conceptual development of peace studies the Roman dictum "if you desire peace prepare for war" is a useful springboard. This idea, which survives today in modern strategies of strong defense, deterrence and balance of power, conforms closely to the concept of negative peace. In this traditional view peace is defined only as the absence of war. The practice of peacekeeping is partly dependent on this strategy of countervailing force but it is tempered by negotiation, conflict reduction and confidence building.

Since 1960 peace studies have focused on understanding the dynamics of a different premise embodied in the maxim: "if you desire peace prepare for peace." This concept involves the strategies of peacemaking and peacebuilding which strive to improve autonomy, equality, human rights, political participation and social justice and to reduce levels of socio-economic oppression which result in conflict, disease, early mortality, hunger, ignorance, poverty, violence and denial of human potential. These forms of socio-economic deprivation are attributed to conditions of structural violence, a perspective introduced by the theoretician Johan Galtung to explain the linkage between the social

structure and peacelessness. This critical view of the negative effects of social interaction can be applied at the international, regional, national, community and familial levels. The alternative state of positive peace encompasses non-violent conflict resolution, respect for standards of justice, satisfaction of basic human needs and compliance with norms for human rights. In this new conception peace would not be present in the absence of war if conditions of structural violence that breed war are still prevalent.

The meaning of peace has also been expanded through various definitions of violence. The trend already cited above has been to extend the concept of violence beyond the basic idea of direct violence connoting physical assault by force. In 1975 Galtung noted that violence was "anything avoidable that impedes human self-realization"; from another perspective he defined this as any situation "when human beings are being influenced so that their mental realizations are below their potential." The theoretical concept of structural violence has been substantiated by empirical data from quantitative studies. For example, Gernot Kohler and Norman Alcock used life expectancy data in different countries which revealed that in one year, 1965, there were 14 to 18 million deaths from structural violence, 92,000 from civil wars and 23,000 from international violence. This study also showed that less developed countries where 69 percent of world population lives suffered 96 percent of the structural violence, 99.9 percent of the civil war and 91 percent of the international violence.[4] In 1990 Galtung introduced the idea of cultural violence as an analytic concept to cover the use of culture to legitimize direct or structural violence. He conceived that cultural, direct and structural violence were linked in a triangle with interlocking means and ends. The history of anti-semitism and racism provide many examples of this vicious triangle at work in society.

Goals and strategies for achieving peace are another dimension of the conceptual foundations of peace studies which, as a field, is committed to the normative process of non-violent conflict resolution. Most scholars no longer see a conflict-free utopia as a realistic or desirable goal; instead conflict is perceived as a natural byproduct of social interaction which can function to promote useful social change when directed by progressive vision. Three means-ends equations define the basic goals of peace study and praxis. The goal of negative peace is approached by peacekeeping action as exemplified by U.N. forces which strive to restore peace in war-torn regions.[5] The goal of

non-violent conflict resolution is pursued by peacemaking which takes place through diplomacy, negotiation, mediation and other techniques designed to cool off dangerous situations, promote understanding and reconcile differences through compromise, bargaining and other means. Finally the goal of positive peace is sought through peacebuilding as illustrated by projects to improve education, environmental conditions, health, living standards and political participation and to assure equality, human rights and social justice.[6]

Since 1960 the field of peace studies has grown and diversified in response to external world conditions and internal pressures within the field. Institutionalization is a fairly reliable indicator of the international growth of the field. By 1990 there were a total of 57 regional and international peace research and training organizations; of these 20 or about 35 percent were founded before 1960 with 15 or 26 percent arising in the 1960's, 13 or 23 percent in the 1970's and 9 or 16 percent in the 1980's. Regional distribution of these organizations was unbalanced; of the 57, 39 or 68 percent were in Europe with 8 or 14 percent being U.N. based, 6 or 11 percent in North America, 3 or 5 percent in Latin America and 1 or 2 percent in Africa. Thus the international perspective on peace research is highly concentrated in Europe. Another measure of the growth of international outlooks in the field is the number of national research and training organizations with a global focus. In this spectrum by 1990 there were 240 institutions of which 54 or 23 percent existed prior to 1960; 64 or 27 percent emerged in the 1960's, 89 or 37 percent in the 1970's, and 33 or 14 percent in the 1980's. Europe and North America were again the predominant locations of these institutions; 121 or 50 percent were in Europe whereas 66 or 28 percent were in North America(U.S. and Canada).[7]

A brief summary of international developments by decade provides a useful overview of trends and growth within the field of peace studies. The 1960's brought the establishment and expansion of many international research institutes which began to do basic studies to develop the knowledge base. Some of their projects included applications of game theory to demonstrate that war was an unrealistic policy tool(an anti-Machiavellian premise); systems analysis and modeling to forecast future trends; studies of the linkage of social organization to war and peace; critiques of the international system of deterrence and balance of power; and design of alternative world institutions.

Quincy Wright, for example, proposed a U.N. system of international law and political organization with reconstruction through education and international institutions. The focus of research in the 1960's was structural change, abolition of war, a new international system and total disarmament through global institutions for conflict resolution.

Other important international influences were the Pacem in Terris Papal Encyclical of 1963 which presented the view of the Roman Catholic Church on world order and the writings of Teilhard de Chardin which explore the role of sciences in building world unity and peace. One of the first organized global efforts in this period to orient education toward the goal of peace was the foundation in 1969 of the International Association of Educators for World Peace(IAEWP). IAEWP, which expanded to 50 chapters worldwide and 15,000 members by 1988, supports peace research and advocates education for conflict resolution, human rights and development of every individual's full potential.

The 1970's brought more concrete and focused institution building which aimed to strengthen the linkage between research, education and action. In 1970 the Consortium on Peace Research, Education and Development(COPRED) was founded as an affiliate of the International Peace Research Association(IPRA). COPRED which is based in North America has endured as a network of institutions, research centers and individuals; it absorbed and publishes Peace and Change, a journal started in 1964 by the Council on Peace Research in History. The Peace Education Network(PEN) was founded by COPRED in the 1970's to promote education related to non-violent conflict resolution and justice issues. In Europe another IPRA affiliate, the Peace Education Commission(PEC) was established in 1971; PEC published the first praxis manual, A Handbook on Peace Education, in 1974. IPRA organized a summer school in peace research which focused on topics like non-violence, the role of women in African liberation struggles and the relation between peace research and the establishment.

The focus of peace education broadened in this period in response to awareness of new world issues. The field of development education, informed by the assymetrical conflict in Vietnam, focused on the economic relationship between first and third world countries in the analysis of global poverty and maldevelopment. Paulo Freire's idea of "conscientization", a dialogic pedagogy



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

which strives to empower oppressed people to work for their liberation by linking social needs assessment with literacy training, had wide international influence. Another pioneer in the tactics of non-violent social change for impoverished people was Danilo Dolci whose work in rural Sicily attracted world-wide attention. Disarmament education, which emphasized the need to control, limit or reduce arms and develop policies of unilateral or total disarmament, developed more in Europe than in the U.S. or Third World. Human rights education sought to build awareness of human rights abuses and to teach the standards embodied in the 1948 U.N. declaration.

United Nations efforts gave a major boost to international peace education efforts in the decade of the 1970's. In 1972 the UN University was established with headquarters in Tokyo to coordinate a global network of research and training centers which focus on problems of human development, survival and welfare.[3] Regulations and standards for education for international understanding, cooperation and peace were adapted by the U.N. in 1974; this mandate resulted in publication of directories, handbooks, research surveys and teacher's guides to improve school-based instruction on peace and conflict. National U.N. commissions disseminated programs on development studies, global problems, human rights education, multicultural education and world studies. UNESCO sponsored research and conferences on curriculum integration of peace studies and on the role of youth in peace action. In 1977 the Associated Schools Project focusing on peace and human rights education was extended to higher education. UNESCO sponsored an International Congress on Teaching Human Rights in Vienna in 1978 which produced guidelines for curriculum development, instructional material and teaching methods. A UNESCO prize for human rights teaching was inaugurated in 1978. The following year a college level text on human rights was published. An International Institute for the Study of Human Rights was established in 1979 to advance interdisciplinary research in the field.

Research in the decade of the 1970's was characterized by expansion of topics, refinement of analysis, focus on development issues and examination of theories like structural violence and the effects of center-periphery relations on human potential. The linkage between maldevelopment, militarism, poverty and repression received close attention. Europe and the Third World were major contributors to this critical theory of development dynamics. Among the

other topics receiving attention were application of behavior models to international crises, connections between peace research and action, conversion to a peace economy, design of preferred worlds, international security, non-violence, peace movements, the role of scientists, U.N. effectiveness, and war termination.[9]

During the decade of the 1980's the issues of disarmament and nuclear proliferation became a major concern in peace studies and education. UNESCO sponsored the World Congress on Disarmament Education at Paris in 1980; the focus of these sessions was the effect of the arms race on world development, arms control and weapons technology. A teachers' handbook with proposals for curriculum integration was developed. The goal of this effort was to apply critical thinking to identify realistic steps needed to reduce armaments and abolish war. A reader on disarmament education was published in 1981; teacher training seminars were also held. Momentum for this effort was also sustained by a Second International Conference held in 1983. The rise of popular nuclear disarmament movements in Australia, Europe, Japan, New Zealand and the U.S. led to wider efforts by teachers to introduce the issues of the arms race, nuclear disarmament and peace in schools. The effects of war on youth was the subject of the First International Symposium on Children and War sponsored by the Finnish Peace Research Institute in 1983. Public awareness of the mounting danger from nuclear proliferation was aroused by the educational efforts of the International Physicians for Prevention of Nuclear War. This group, which was founded in 1980 and expanded into a multinational network of 135,000 physicians, won the Nobel Peace Prize for its efforts to disseminate accurate information about the catastrophic effects of nuclear war.

U.N. and UNESCO efforts were also important in promoting applied peace research. In 1980 the University for Peace was established at Escazu, Costa Rica; its curriculum development focused on three core areas:(1) global problems which stand as obstacles to peace, (2) quality of life in social, economic and cultural spheres, and (3) the planetary civic order or political governance dimensions of world order. The U.N. University moved ahead with its research programs for peace and global transformation which are examining the ties between development and collective survival. In this project development is defined as social change to empower human improvement; basic needs are identified as ecological security, multicultural awareness and peace.

The focus of general efforts for peace and human rights education also expanded in the 1980's. In 1981 UNESCO established its annual prize for peace education; these awards brought international recognition to exemplary projects and helped to define the integration of peace studies, education and action. Recipients included the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute(1982) for its studies of the international arms race; Pax Christi(1983) for efforts on behalf of disarmament, human rights and non-violence; International Textbook Research(1985) for working to reduce prejudice in textbooks and Paulo Freire(1986) for his innovative pedagogy for the liberation of oppressed peoples. UNESCO also began publishing a Yearbook on Peace and Conflict Studies in the 1980's to amplify coverage and dissemination of research trends. U.N. efforts on behalf of human rights education were also numerous; an International Documentation Center was created to distribute information for teaching, expert meetings were held and a resource base was developed through publication of teaching guides, a newsletter, a yearbook and a compilation of human rights instruments. Elimination of racism and colonialism was added to the general UNESCO focus on disarmament, human rights and peace. More global unity in peace education was promoted by foundation of the Congress of World Federation of UNESCO Clubs and Associations; this body, which included clubs in 90 countries, met in 1981 and 1987.

In 1988 the World Association for Schools as an Instrument of Peace inaugurated international training courses in the teaching of human rights and peace at its Geneva headquarters; these courses are focused on K-12, vocational and teacher education. The U.N. General Assembly's adoption of the Declaration on Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace in 1988 brought new initiatives on behalf of peace and disarmament research and education. The International Meeting on 21st Century Studies in 1989 reviewed the issues of economic development, environmental conservation and peace. The same year the International Congress on Peace in the Minds of Men at Yamoussoukko, Ivory Coast issued a declaration calling for cooperative educational efforts on behalf of peace, attitude changes and programs to advance regional cooperation, environmental quality and cultural, economic, scientific and social development. The International Peace Olympiad on March 14, 1989 called for cease fires in all conflicts with peaceful cultural exchanges to cultivate world opinion for fellowship, peace and international understanding; this idea is a

revival of the practice of temporary peace associated with the Olympic Games of ancient Greece.

Research in the 1980's developed new perspectives on old problems and branched out into a number of new areas. For example, alternative international security systems were designed and the idea of common global security was proposed as an alternative to national security. Much attention was paid to the processes of peace education; these included knowledge transmission, action learning, attitude change and non-formal education. The connections of peace research and peace education with feminism and peace movements was examined in greater depth. In the United Kingdom and the United States a grassroots peace education movement embraced traditional concerns like war and disarmament along with community and individual development, value change, consciousness-raising and curriculum integration; parents, teachers and peace groups were active in this endeavor.[10]

III.

The field of peace studies has experienced internal divisions along with external criticism from academic and political interest groups. The internal divisions, which concern scope, methodology and goals, appear to be a healthy indicator of dynamism in a young field of study. A major rift within peace studies separates humanists who focus on values, verbal models, alternative futures and value analysis from scientists who concentrate on facts, theory-building, data construction and hypothesis testing. The scientific camp, which is less numerous than the humanists, is also divided into pure science which rejects the normative focus and applied science which hopes that peace research can end the suffering caused by peace-denying social conditions.

A third school of thought arising from a New Left orientation rejects quantitative behavioral peace research and focuses on the need for continuous revolution. In the eyes of the Left the main global peace issue is First World neo-imperialism; this was defined as political violence directed against the Third World and control of the global economy. Critics rejected this position and maintained that inter-ethnic violence in the Third World was far more significant as an obstruction of peace.[11] The radical position, which centers around the need to overcome conditions of structural violence, attracted other criticism from two camps. On the one hand, scholars in the sociological establishment dismissed the idea of structural violence as an unproven

theoretical construct. On the other hand, Marxists attacked the radical position as counter-revolutionary; in their view removing structural violence which functions as a source of conflict would interrupt the historic process of conflict-driven revolutionary change.[12] Another split has developed on the issue of whether the field should focus on peacebuilding or war prevention. Finally, Western peace researchers disagree on the extent to which they should integrate their efforts with political activism or traditional pacifism.

Other internal divisions are evident in comparing peace studies goals and perspectives in different parts of the world. Diversity arises because of variations in needs and problems. In Europe where armaments, militarism and the nuclear threat loomed large, peace studies have concentrated on disarmament, human rights and development education. Particular emphasis was placed on the relationship between the arms race and human improvement efforts. North American programs have focused less on development and disarmament issues and more on general peace and conflict studies; however, nuclear age education spread widely in the 1980's in response to the failure of the nuclear freeze campaign. In Japan programs of "A-Bomb education" were developed in the 1960's at Hiroshima and Nagasaki; their goal is to build awareness of defense alternatives. Peace studies in Australia and New Zealand, which are concerned with nuclear testing and militarization in the Pacific region, have gained significant government support. The Australian Labor government established a peace and disarmament section in its Department of Foreign Affairs in the 1980's; a peace research center was also created in the Australian National University.

In the Third World where vital issues concern hunger, illiteracy, inadequate health care, malnutrition, neo-imperialism, poverty, racism, social injustice and other manifestations of structural violence the foundation of peace studies is development. The goals of education are to build awareness among the common people of their economic and political situation and to encourage them to participate in action to change their condition. Some Third World scholars regard the imposition or adoption of Western culture as a peace obstructing force; they report that Westernization has brought cultural imperialism, denial of human rights, ecological destruction, ideological rigidity, growth of violence, and militarization and fragmentation of rich and poor both between and within nations.

Different regions of the Third World have produced unique versions of peace studies which fit local needs and heritage. In India Gandhian approaches which focus on non-violence and passivé resistance are employed to gain social and political reforms in community development projects; education aims to develop awareness of injustice and exploitation and to restore the dignity and self-respect of the community.[13] This strategy is also practised in Latin America with somewhat different means. Leaders like Helder Don Camera have founded community literacy programs which seek to empower local people to understand the cause and effects of economic under-development and develop viable alternatives.[14] Peace research and education for development have not fared as well in Africa; one inhibiting factor may be the persistence of inter-ethnic violence which prevents formation of a more critical awareness of region-wide problems.

External critics of peace studies represent traditional academic orientations and right wing political concerns. Many critics come from the field of international security studies; from their perspective war and peace are determined by power politics which are so complex that interim partial solutions are often the only possible approach. Therefore, some of these scholars reject the peace studies assumption that domestic social reforms are linked to world peace. However, this view is contradicted by a study by Alvin L. Jacobson which showed a correlation between conflict growth and differential growth rates in 39 nations between 1950 and 1960. Other criticisms by security studies scholars include the views that consciousness raising is an inappropriate means of war prevention, that peace studies scholars misconceive of peace as an umbrella concept for everything good and that their focus on ultimate solutions, which may be impossible to achieve, is useless.[15] However, these arguments overlook the importance of an informed citizenry in a democracy and fail to acknowledge the large body of peace research which focuses on particular variables, applied skills and limited rather than absolute solutions.

Other critics have charged that peace research is a pseudo-science. D.Kagan, for example, claims that the influence of pacifism, morality and scientizing for the sake of appearance undermines the veracity of the field. Arthur N. Gilbert and Paul G. Laurens have observed that crisis management literature is too abstract, neglects the effects of events and personalities, lacks historical sensitivity and offers inadequate prescriptions.[16] Other

critics, like R.Bruce Douglas, accept some peace studies proposals while rejecting others; Douglas, for example, agrees that poverty is a correlate of war and that development is peace promoting but argues that justice must include the rule of international law and not just redistribution of resources.[17]

Right wing critics in Australia, England and the U.S. have denounced peace studies as part of a Communist plot to subvert Western democracies.[18] They claim that peace educators are 'fellow travellers' who teach appeasement and peace at all costs while the Soviets teach non-coexistence with capitalism. In England critics from the Cold War 'balance of power' camp have attacked the campaign for unilateral disarmament as a destabilizing force in international security. Many critics maintain that peace studies should stop confusing peace with pacifism and focus on defense of democratic values, freedom and truth. These critics are empowered by the legacy of danger associated with appeasement and the record of Soviet aggression. However, their perspective reflects a simplistic view of real world conditions and a selective and shallow awareness of peace studies literature. Nevertheless, right wing attacks grew in intensity during the 1980's when peace education achieved its widest influence in K-12 instruction and higher education.

IV.

The development of applied tactics or praxis in peace studies is still in a state of evolution because of the recent emergence of the field. Nevertheless much of the research and education is focused on achieving levels of understanding which can be translated into meaningful action. The knowledge base of the field has expanded rapidly since 1960. Two general traditions of research were identified by Wallensteen. On the one hand, the dialectical tradition involves a struggle with the intellectual challenge posed by Machiavelli that violence is unavoidable, instrumental and effective as a means of conflict resolution and with the moral challenge of 20th century war. The Utopist tradition, on the other hand, works to reformulate utopian ideas into researchable topics based on the realization of preferred alternative worlds.

Hanna Newcombe has identified four major schools of peace research which she defines as traditional, quantitative-behavioral, radical and policy oriented.[19] The traditional school, which began before 1960, produces mostly historical, legal and philosophical studies. Kenneth Boulding, an economist,

defines peace research as "the intersection of international relations and conflict/conflict resolution theory"; as such it involves studies within several disciplines. These include economics, ethics, history, international law, political science, psychology and sociology. International relations theory in this period is integrationist and functionalist in spirit. For example, the sociologist Amitai Etzioni(1965) concluded that peace was more likely with depolarization and supra-national political unification. From another perspective studies of the psychology of conflict have revealed a positive relation between war and higher levels of civilization in which competition, inequality and conflict tend to produce violence.[20] Finally, an historical study by Naroll of the deterrent value of armaments from 225 B.C. to 1776 A.D. showed that armaments did not reduce the frequency of war.

Quantitative-behavioral research which mostly dates after 1960 is interdisciplinary and relies on mathematics, statistics and social science analysis.[21] Topics investigated could well comprise a core curriculum for peace studies; these include arms race theory, attitude studies, attitude change, conformity and obedience studies, correlates of war, crisis research, disarmament and crisis game theory, events data analysis, simulation, U.N. behavior and war prediction. The foundation for this type of research was laid well before 1960 by Louis F. Richardson, a pioneer in quantitative peace research; Richardson studied war in relation to many variables like culture, economic factors, length of borders and religion. He is most known for his pathbreaking work in developing differential equations to describe bipolar arms races. These equations include multiple variables like causation of ambition and grievances, defense, expense factors, fatigue and proportionality. A later study by Michael D. Wallace(1979) showed that war was the outcome in 90 percent of the cases where disputes were preceded by arms races but in only 4 percent of disputes where arms races were absent.[22] A paradigm shift arose in 1973 when Dieter Senghaas introduced the concept of autistic arms races which were driven by internal forces like technology and military-industrial complexes.

Radical or critical peace research guided by New Left ideology came into play by 1969. The radicals attacked traditional and quantitative peace research for being a defense of the status quo and the establishment. They claimed that trends like conflict management theory, scientific objectivity and the

focus on symmetric conflict only legitimated the ruling order. In assymetric conflicts like Vietnam, some radicals like H.D. Schmidt(1968) held that peace research must increase confrontation, conflict and polarization to support the oppressed parties. Johan Galtung, one of the leading theorists, explained the world in socio-structural terms as a series of center-periphery or topdog-underdog relationships; he developed a theory of rank disequilibrium which held, for example, that nations high on one factor like economic growth but low on prestige were more conflict prone due to their status imbalance. In symmetric conflict(topdog vs topdog) Galtung felt that conflict was best resolved by associative strategies; in assymetric conflict(topdog vs underdog) disassociative tactics like self-reliance, non-violence and economic autonomy were proposed. The influence of Gandhi on Galtung's theory is very clear in this situation. Other radical theorists like Lars Dencik rejected disassociation and called for revolution.

Applied or policy-based research is focused mainly on proposals related to arms and hostility problems which together constitute the threat component in international relations. A general goal for much of this research is to establish reliable means for moving toward conditions of stable peace. Stable peace is defined as a reduction of arms and hostility to near zero. Costa Rica which has no army, for example, would qualify as a state with policies oriented toward stable peace. Some research topics often found in policy studies include alternative security systems, conflict resolution, cultural exchange, disarmament, non-military defense, peacekeeping, superordinate goals, tension reduction, verification of disarmament and world government.

Several innovative problem-solving proposals have emerged from policy research. One of these is the method known as graduated reciprocation in tension reduction(GRIT); this technique integrates security assurances, flexible planning and unpredictability in a step by step interaction process designed to defuse tension before it erupts in violence. Another proposal involves conflict resolution through controlled communication which brings social scientists to the same table with conflicting government leaders to provide interpretation of disputes and advice on resolution tactics. Alternative security systems have been proposed which would replace traditional norms of national security and military security with new plans for global people's security. This new comprehensive security arrangement would encompass guarantees for

basic economic growth, education, environmental protection, health, human rights, resource protection and welfare. Another proposal which has gained serious review by several European governments is the concept of non-violent non-military defense planning. In this strategy the goal is to defend social structure and values rather than territory by a disciplined use of Gandhian methods. The chief tactic employed is passive resistance to conquest and oppression which requires withdrawal of obedience and denial of the means to rule through non-cooperation.

V.

Peace education developed eclectically after 1960 and now encompasses many fields related to world or global studies. The emphasis in different programs varies by world regions. In the U.S. peace and conflict studies curricula are found in global education, international studies, world order studies, nuclear age education, conflict studies, war studies, international relations and security studies. In Europe disarmament education, human rights education, development education, international relations and security studies are popular. Human rights and development education are predominant in the Third World.

Burns Weston provides a useful overview of the way peace studies has divided from its ancestral field of international relations. In peace studies the focus is value-oriented, the goal is prescription, the time is future and the interests are global. By contrast in international relations the focus is on value free analysis, description of events, past and present time and national interests. While peace studies covers the global role of diverse units like individuals and international organizations, international relations mainly examines the role of governing elites and nation states. In peace studies power involves more than coercion and violence is rejected as a means; international relations, on the other hand, treats power as military and economic manipulation and accepts violence as a potential means to an end.

The practice of peace education has varied considerably as noted above, however, the goals and methods established in the 1960's by the World Order Models Project(WOMP) are still valid and provide a good summary of praxis. The goals set by the project were war prevention, economic welfare, social justice, fuller minority political participation, and restoration of ecological balance to improve quality of life. As is evident from present world conditions

the need for peace education is as valid today as it was in the darkest years of the Cold War. The struggle to overcome these problems is a continuous challenge. The study methods proposed by WOMP are diagnosis, prognosis, development of alternative international systems, evaluation of alternatives, selection of preferred worlds and planning of realistic steps to achieve the transition toward a better future.[23] The similarity of this methodology to medical practice and therapeutic rehabilitation reflects the parallel between sickness in the world and sickness in the body.

Efforts to establish peace education have been developed by colleges and universities, international organizations, national associations, religious organizations and state and local school agencies. The growth of programs since 1960 has been impressive. Twenty of the 57 regional and international peace research institutions surveyed above offer some form of educational program. Nearly 85 percent of these were established after 1960. Programs range from discussion forums to conferences, seminars, symposia, short courses, exhibits, publications, workshops and specialized training programs.

Professional training efforts cover a wide range of concerns and reach many different groups. The International Peace Academy founded in New York in 1967, for example, conducts intensive workshop training for government officials to improve peacemaking skills like control of violence, mediation and peaceful development.[24] The World Association for School As An Instrument of Peace, which was organized in 1967 in Geneva, offers inservice training courses on human rights and peace teaching for teachers at the K-12, vocational and teacher preparation levels. Another focus is taken by the Institute for Alternative Development Research established in Oslo in 1979. The Institute holds seminars as well as summer and night courses on conflict, Fourth World issues, maldevelopment and new strategies for socio-economic growth. Disarmament internships and seminars for women are conducted in Geneva and New York by the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom which was founded in Geneva in 1915.

In addition to the training done by international organizations educational programs are also sponsored by 89 of the 240 national associations surveyed. Eighty-five percent of these educational projects developed after 1960. Most of the projects concern global and local issues related to peace and conflict studies and range from summer courses to full scale degree programs. Some

examples include radio and TV programs sponsored by the Peace Research Center of the Australian National University; a course on methods of peace education in kindergartens offered by the Hungarian Peace Council; training conferences on Gandhi's ideas and methods of social change conducted by the Institute of Gandhian Thought and Peace Studies; and workshops for K-6 teachers on the linkage of the arms race to world poverty offered by the Irish Commission for Justice and Peace.

Several international religious organizations and networks have played an important role in global efforts to improve peace education. After the Papal Encyclical, Pacem in Terris, in 1963 many Catholic educators introduced new curricula focused on peace and world order issues. The Bahai faith has long promoted the goal of world unity or government as an alternative to national sovereignty; recently the Bahais have engaged in peace education based on a new global economics and social justice. The Society of Friends supports a worldwide program of peace action and education which strives to alleviate the suffering caused by war and structural violence and to intervene in the interest of conflict reconciliation. A world network of religious peace organizations is affiliated with the Fellowship for Reconciliation. Another important effort to link religion to peacebuilding was developed by the World Conference on Religion and Peace which first met in 1970; by 1984 when this organization held its fourth meeting in Nairobi, delegates from all major religions attended from 60 countries. The Conference, which is committed to peace education based on development and disarmament, strives to improve inter-religious trust and understanding in the context of regional tensions.

The degree to which peace education has been integrated into school curricula within nations is not easy to ascertain. Data on the Unesco Associated Schools program is one source of verification for integration. Another indirect source is the output of curriculum guides and articles on peace studies in national educational databases; entries on peace in the U.S. ERIC database show a dramatic increase in the 1980's: 512 citations(1966-1975), 525(1976-1982), and 950(1983-1990). A similar trend was observed in the U.K. by Nigel Young.[25] Higher education programs have also grown dramatically; U.S. data show peace studies courses offered on 50 U.S. campuses in 1974. In 1983 peace studies programs were found on 38 campuses; by 1987 such programs were operating on 238 campuses. They ranged from Ph.D. level to

undergraduate minors.[26] Y.Satow reports the parallel growth of peace studies in Canadian universities.[27] Nonetheless, funding and resources remain inadequate in many cases. M.V.Naidu, for example, reports that peace research in Canada received minimal funding of just 1.3 percent of all social studies and humanities research grants.[28]

VI.

The future direction of peace studies and education will be shaped by emergent social problems which involve issues and values generic to conflict resolution and peacebuilding. Some of these issues are authoritarianism, child abuse, environmental destruction, ethnocentric conflict, the global arms trade, nuclear proliferation, racism, resource redistribution to improve life in poor countries and sexism.

Some trends in peace research and education represent extensions and refinement of earlier investigations. For example, a survey of recent research shows the ongoing study of topics like psychology of violence, global policy, biological roots of aggression, models of international conflict, effects of the arms race, ethical beliefs, sociology of war and economic cycles and war. There is also a growth of studies on comparative, historical and psychological aspects of peace. In peace education visible trends include genocide awareness, inner-city based peace studies, critical action research, community education(Northern Ireland and Neve Shalom, Israel), linkages between sports and peace, environmental issues, creative conflict resolution, maternal roles and the relationship between feminism and peace.

Another trend involves future projections by scholars who write about developmental needs within the field. In Europe a new school of policy-based research is emerging with a focus on alternative security systems based on the concepts of "common security" and military doctrines of "non-offensive defense". This represents a departure from the Galtungian school of socio-structural criticism which was dominant in Europe over the last two decades.[29]

Several scholars have commented on the need for greater integration of research findings with education and action.[30] On the one hand, personal affirmative non-violence and human interaction potential have been proposed as alternatives to some of the academic detachment within the field. Another

important dimension of this problem is the need to coordinate career awareness and guidance with peace studies and student internships.

Some earlier needs assessments remain valid today. For example, Kenneth Boulding in 1978 noted that peace studies should focus more on the need for global peace policy development and strive for greater influence on international politics.[31] J.David Singer reported in 1976 that peace research should focus on substantive issues like social reform and economic development while also educating the public to develop more problem solving capacities and interests.[32] Integration of ecology concerns into peace research is also emerging as a critical future need.[33]

One major trend in peace education is recognition of the need to incorporate an action component in the curricula. One model for this is the curriculum at Earlham College which requires on-campus co-curricular experiences, off campus internships and foreign study as part of its peace program.[34] A proposal for experiential education in non-violent social change by K.M. Weigart focuses on the study of violence in human nature, structural violence, analysis of social change in relation to ideas of power, visions of a better world and group action.[35] Anatol Rapoport proposed a "fusion approach" for integrating peace action, education and research; in this model activists, educators and researchers each engage in the three roles of action, education and research.[36] The intent is to eliminate the isolation of the specialist and promote cross-fertilization of ideas from different branches of peace work.

Reexamination of feminist perspectives on peace studies and education has also emerged as a new focus.[37] The field has long been enriched by contributions by women. However, women have hitherto been more predominant in peace movement action and education than in research. As they become more active in research it is likely that some new paradigms will emerge. The content focus of peace education is also extending into new fields like environmental security which are vital to the survival of life on earth. Future imaging, awareness of the potential of alternative life styles and practical instruction in political action skills would be useful parts of a curriculum to prepare students for action to save the environment. One of the most important orientations for peace education is to empower students to perceive the linkage between local action and global peace.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In conclusion, the international development and structure of peace studies have reflected the emergence of a global culture and awareness after World War II. This development is associated with the shrinkage of distance brought about by the revolution in communications and transportation. Another major influence was the proliferation of global destructive power in nuclear weapons stockpiles. Concern for planetary survival and unity may also have been rekindled by the Apollo images of earth from space. These striking photographs illustrated better than words the solitary and unique nature of the planet on which we all depend for life. The growth of international institutions and global perspectives in peace research and education has expanded the knowledge base and human resources needed in the search for workable solutions to world problems. This development has been strengthened by the continuity between past and present peace studies which is based on refocusing human potential on life-enhancing means of conflict resolution as an alternative to life-denying means of achieving political ends.

Endnotes

1. See E. Herman, "The international peace education movement 1919-1939" in C. Chatfield and P.Van den Dungen, Eds. Peace Movements and Political Cultures. (Knoxville, Tenn.: University of Tennessee Press, 1988), pp.127-142.

2. For a good summary of this development see Elise Boulding, "Nongovernmental organizations," Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars 41(August,1985):94-96.

3. See J.Rotblat, Scientists in the Quest for Peace: A History of the Pugwash Conferences. (Cambridge,Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1972).

4. Gernot Kohler and Norman Alcock, "An empirical table of structural violence," Journal of Peace Research (1976): 343-356.

5. For coverage of this process see: R.Swift, "United Nations military training for peace," International Organization 28: 267-280; see also James C. Wise, "How not to fight: putting together a U.S. Army force for a UN peacekeeping operation," Military Review 57 (December,1977): 20-31.

6. For an overview of these three strategies see: Johan Galtung, "Three realistic approaches to peace: peacekeeping, peacemaking and peacebuilding," Impact of Science on Society 26 (January, 1976): 103-115.

7. Data source for survey: World Directory of Peace Research and Training Institutions, 7th Ed. (Paris: Unesco, 1991).

8. See J.A. Joyce, "The case for a world university," Contemporary Review 221 (November,1972): 249-253; Huitor G. DeSouza, "The United Nations University: global survival, development and welfare," Development 1(1988): 47-48.

9. For reviews of research developments in this period see: Juergen Dedring, Recent advances in peace and conflict research: a critical survey, (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage, 1976); C.F. Fink and Kenneth E. Boulding, Eds., "Peace research in transition: a symposium," Journal of Conflict Resolution 16 (December, 1972): 463-616; Norman V. Walbek, "Notes on expanding the concerns of peace research," International Interactions 3 (1977): 181-190.

10. For general surveys of research preceding this decade see: William Eckhardt, "St.Louis seminar on peace research: war/peace attitudes, events and values," Bulletin of Peace Proposals 14 (1983): 187-189; Hakan Wiberg, "JPR 1964-1980 - What have we learnt about peace?," Journal of Peace Research 18 (June, 1981): 111-148.

11. For details on these conflicting perspectives see: Asbjorn Eide, "Global and parochial perspectives in international studies and peace research," Journal of

Peace Research 12 (1975): 79-86; N.G. Onuf, "Peace research parochialism," Journal of Peace Research 12 (1975): 71-78.

12. See Peter D. Scott, "Peace, power and revolution: Peace Studies, Marxism and the Academy," Alternatives 9 (Winter 1983/84): 351-372.

13. See also Anima Bose, "A Gandhian perspective on peace," Journal of Peace Research 18 (April/June, 1981): 159-164.

14. For further treatment of this development in Latin America see: Jaime Diaz, "Learning through action in a violent environment: an experience of adult non-formal education at the grassroots level," Bulletin of Peace Proposals 15 (1984): 157-162.

15. For more detail on these divergent viewpoints see: George H. Quester, "International security criticisms of peace research," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 504 (July,1989): 98-105; Alvin L. Jacobson, "Conflict in developing nations: a test of interaction hypotheses," International Interactions 2 (1976): 141-150; R. Smoke, "The 'peace' of deterrence and the 'peace' of the anti-nuclear war movement," Political Psychology 5 (December, 1984): 741-748.

16. D.Kagan, "The pseudo-science of peace," Public Interest 78 (Winter, 1985): 43-61; Arthur N. Gilbert and Paul G. Lauren, "Crisis management: an assessment and critique," Journal of Conflict Resolution 24 (December, 1980): 641-664; for a critique of the position of Gilbert and Lauren see Ole R. Holsti, Historians, social scientist and crisis management: an alternative view," Journal of Conflict Resolution 24 (December, 1980): 665-682.

17. R. Bruce Douglass, "Is distributive justice the new name of peace?," World Affairs 141 (Fall,1978): 153-164.

18. An elaboration of this outlook is found in: John D. Frodshom, "Peace Studies," World Affairs 147 (Fall, 1984): 51-56.

19. Hanna Newcombe, "Survey of peace research," Peace Research Reviews 9: 1-95.

20. See William Eckhardt, "Conditions of peace suggested by some quantitative studies of primitive war," Peace Research 23 (August, 1989): 37-39.

21. For general and particular overviews of this school see: Walter Isard, "A definition of peace science, the queen of social sciences,Part II," Journal of Peace Science 4 (Spring, 1980): 97-132; Michael D. Intriligator, "Research on conflict theory," Journal of Conflict Resolution 26 (June, 1982): 307-327.

22. Michael D. Wallace, "Arms races and escalation: some new evidence," Journal of Conflict Resolution 23 (March,1979): 3-16.

23. For examples of these approaches see: Mendlovitz, Saul, Ed. On the creation of a just world order: preferred worlds for the 1990's. (N.Y.: Free Press, 1975); Paul Wehr and Michael Washburn, Peace and world order systems teaching and research. (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage, 1976).

24. See M. Harbottle, " The International Peace Academy: an experiment in training," International Relations 4 (November, 1972): 127-136.

25. Nigel Young, "Some current controversies in the new peace education movement: debates and perspectives," Bulletin of Peace Proposals 15 (1984): 103-109.

26. For data see: Mary E. Cummins and Wayne E. Wlodarski, Directory of National Peace Studies Programs (Dayton, Ohio: University of Dayton, 1974); M.A. Dugan, "Peace studies at the graduate level," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 504 (July, 1989): 72-79; George A. Lopez, "Trends in college curricula and programs," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 504 (July,1989): 61-71.

27. Y. Satow, "Peace studies in Canadian universities," Journal of American and Canadian Studies 3 (Spring, 1989): 25-42.

28. M.V. Naidu, "SSHRCC and peace studies," Peace Research 21 (January,1989): 1-12.

29. See R. Rudney, "The varieties of peace research in Western Europe," Comparative Strategy 9 (1990): 137-146.

30. See William Eckhardt, "Integrating peace research, peace education and peace action," Peace Research 20 (January,1988): 65-78.

31. Kenneth Boulding, "Future directions in conflict and peace studies," Journal of Conflict Resolution 22 (1978): 342-354.

32. J.David Singer, "An assessment of peace research," International Security 1 (Summer, 1976): 118-137.

33. See W. Rudig, "Peace and ecology movements in Western Europe," West European Politics 11 (January,1988): 26-39.

34. A.G. Bing, "Peace studies as experiential education," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences 504 (July, 1989): 48-60.

35. K.M. Weigert, "Peace Studies as education for non-violent social change," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 504 (July,1989): 37-47.

36. Reported by William Eckhardt, "Bridging the gap between peace action, education and research," Journal of Peace Research 25 (June,1988): 179-185.

37. See Birgit Brock-Utne, Feminist perspectives on peace and peace education (New York: Pergamon Press, 1989); see also Birgit Brock-Utne, "The relationship of feminism to peace and peace education," Bulletin of Peace Proposals 15 (1984):149-154 in which she reports Gandhi's view that women exceeded men in their capacity to achieve peace and non-violent conflict resolution and his recollection that he had learned of non-violence and civil disobedience from British suffragettes.

THE WORLD EDUCATION FELLOWSHIP
U.S. SECTION

and

THE WORLD EDUCATION FELLOWSHIP
CONNECTICUT CHAPTER

present

**THE WORLD EDUCATION FELLOWSHIP**

**36th BIENNIAL INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE**

# *Education In and For a Changing World*

August 17-20th, 1992

*Conference Chairpersons*
Mrs. Mary Phelps
Dr. Frank Stone

*Honorary Chairperson*
Dr. Mildred Haipt

Conference Director/Registrar
Dr. George Tenney

Dr. Gucluol graduated from Bolu Teacher Training School, Necati Educational Institute, Northern Michigan University (B.A. and M.A.) and Michigan State University (Ph.D.). He has worked at all levels of education as a teacher and administrator. He also served at various Departments and Divisions of the Ministry of National Education in Turkey as a Secondary School Specialist, member of the National Board of Education, and as an Assistant Undersecretary. Since 1975 he has taught Foundation and Administrative Courses in Education and Comparative and International Education, and worked as the Department Chairman and the Dean of Faculty of Education at the Middle East Technical University and Firat University in Turkey.

✓ 2:00-3:00 **International Development of Peace Research and Education: 1960-1990**
Dr. David Woolman (United States)
*Seminar Room C*

This historical analysis of the international growth of peace studies from 1960 to 1990 covers the field's origins, motivating forces, conceptual foundations, praxis, and developmental dynamics. Internal debates and external criticisms are reviewed along with an evaluation of the field's effects on pedagogy and society. Particular attention is given to the role of research institutes, religious organizations, international schools and the United Nations. Comparative development of peace studies relative to cultural experience is examined, along with impact of contributions by major scholars and practitioners in shaping the field. Future directions of peace studies and education are projected as a function of new crises and conflict dimensions in a global society.

Dr. Woolman is Acting Director/Librarian of Curriculum Resource Center and Adjunct Professor of History, Rhode Island College. Ph.D. in Educational Studies, University of Connecticut, 1984. Co-Director of Fulbright Egypt Study Project (Curriculum Development), 1977-79. Teacher Education, Nigeria, U.S. Peace Corps, 1964-67. Author of publications on philosophy of peace education, educational thought of Johan Galtung and American reconstructionists, social functions of Iranian education, role of science and technology in modern Egypt,and black literature for high school curriculum.

✓ 3:45 **Depart for Wadsworth Atheneum**
*(Board Motor Coach at Parking Lot "L" - Lincoln Center Theatre/Adjacent to Park River Apts.)*

✓ 4:00-5:00 **Wadsworth Atheneum Tour**
Mrs. Maurine Plettner, Wadsworth Atheneum

✓ 5:00-6:00 **Reception/Wadsworth Atheneum**
***Morgan Great Hall***

✓ 6:00-8:00 **Recognition Dinner/Wadsworth Atheneum**
***Morgan Great Hall***

*Honored Guests:*
**Mrs. Rosemary Crommelin**
**Dr. Marion Brown**